

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for his careful consideration of this application and for the very helpful interview held on July 10, 2006, which is summarized below. Reconsideration of this application is now respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1-20 are now pending in this application, with Claims 1, 9, and 12 being independent claims. Claims 21-23 have been cancelled without prejudice.

Summary of Interview of July 10, 2006: As noted above, Applicants' undersigned representative conducted an interview with the Examiner on July 10, 2006. The general subject matter discussed at this interview was how the Lindwer reference (U.S. Patent No. 6,298,434) was being applied in rejecting various claims. Also discussed were definitions of the terms "thread" and "interpreter." In discussing the Lindwer reference as applied to Claims 21-23 (now cancelled), it was agreed that Lindwer does not teach all of the limitations, as will be discussed further below.

Response to Claim Rejections:

At pages 3-10, the Office Action rejects Claims 1-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Lindwer (U.S. Patent No. 6,298,434). These rejections are respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Claims 1, 9, and 12 have been amended to incorporate the limitations recited in Claims 21-23 (now cancelled). As noted above, during the interview, the Examiner and Applicants' representative discussed the rejection of Claims 21-23, and agreement was reached that Lindwer

fails to teach the limitations found in Claims 21-23.

In particular, one may break down the limitations of Claims 21-23, now incorporated into Claims 1, 9, and 12, into three components: (1) selecting an entry point; (2) into shared execution code; (3) based on stack state. As noted during the interview, Lindwer at col. 5, lines 16-40 was cited in the Office Action as disclosing the limitations of these claims. However, it was shown (and agreed) that Lindwer fails to disclose that an entry point into shared execution code is chosen based on a stack state (i.e., at least one of the three components noted above was not disclosed by Lindwer). Furthermore, Applicants find no further disclosure within Lindwer that remedies this shortcoming. For at least this reason, it is respectfully submitted that Lindwer fails to anticipate Claims 1, 9, and 12, and therefore, also fails to anticipate Claims 2-8, 10, 11, and 13-20, which depend therefrom. An indication of the allowability of Claims 1-20 is, therefore, respectfully requested.

Applicants further note that they do not necessarily agree with the characterizations of either their claims or of the prior art, as discussed in the Office Action and not addressed above, but rather have chosen to focus on only some of the possible arguments. This is not to be understood as tacit concurrence with such characterizations or waiver of additional arguments.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants, therefore, respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is hereby invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jeffrey W. Gluck/

Date: July 11, 2006

Jeffrey W. Gluck, Ph.D.
Registration No. 44,457
VENABLE LLP
P.O. Box 34385
Washington, DC 20043-9998
Telephone: (202) 344-4000
Direct Dial: (202) 344-8017
Telefax: (202) 344-8300